

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandran, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/573,734	03/28/2006	Laurent Tricaud	FR 030116	2254		
65913 7590 12/11/2008 NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			EXAM	EXAMINER		
			HENRY, MAR	HENRY, MARIEGEORGES A		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2455				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			12/11/2008	EI ECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/573,734		TRICAUD, LAURENT		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MARIE GEORGES HENRY	2455		

	MARIE GEORGES HENRY	2455					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it 	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.198(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of valued or 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on	lianas with 27 CER 44 27 must be 4	Eladithin two manths	of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed off Abrier in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			TOL 004)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (I	OL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons wity it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 430(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/saleh najjar/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455	/Marie Georges Henry/ Examiner, Art Unit 2455						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A. The applicant argues "Cromer reference fails to find any support for the Examiner's

assertion that Cromer teaches "playing, during said booting, multimedia content transmitted

by said third party device" (Remark, page 6, lines 15-17).

The examiner disagrees because he interprets the processing of booting of a computer as the same process as waking up of a computer because the same applications are called during both processes.

B. The applicant argues about "processing arrangement to boot upon startup. Applicant notes that without an articulated reason for the assertion of indefiniteness, Applicant has not been afforded an opportunity to respond to any, as yet undisclosed, rational for the reiection." (Remark, bace 7, lines 15-19).

The examiner disagrees because the applicant arguments are not persuasive. The processing arrangements are not detailed enough to allow an ordinary person in the art at the time the invention was made to clearly identified the arrangements that are made while processing of booting is being done for this specific application.